



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,177	03/29/2004	Wei Gu	5199-178	5834
7590	05/31/2007		EXAMINER	
Leslie Gladstone Restaino Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP 163 Madison Avenue P.O. Box 1989 Morristown, NJ 07962-1989			FETTEROLF, BRANDON J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1642	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/813,177	GU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 47,48,54,57 and 61-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 47-48, 54, 57 and 61-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/28/2006.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to the Amendment***

The Amendment filed on 02/27/2007 in response to the previous Non-Final Office Action (9/27/2006) is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 47-48, 54, 57, 61-63 are currently pending and under consideration

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 9/28/2006 is acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner. A signed copy of the IDS is attached hereto.

### **New Rejections Necessitated by Amendment:**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 47-48, 54, 57 and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 47, 54 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the active of steps of determining. In the instant case, it is unclear what activity is being determined or how this activity and/or interaction is being determined.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 61 recites a method for determining whether an agent affects one or more Mdm2-associated, HAUSP-associated, or p53 associated biological events in a cell, comprising the steps of contacting a cell with an agent that is reactive with Mdm2 or HAUSP, as determined by the method of claim 54 or 57. Thus, the claims encompass using a genus of molecules identified in a screening assay.

The specification teaches that modulators of MDM2 and HAUSP can be easily identified by simple screening assays. For example, the specification teaches that cells (e.g., MDM2-null cells or cells comprising MDM2) can be plated onto microtiter plates, then contacted with a library of drugs (paragraph 00128). In particular, the specification teaches that modulators include, but are not limited to, proteins, polypeptides, peptides, nucleic acids (including DNA or RNA), antibodies and fragments thereof, molecules, compounds, antibiotics, drugs, an agent reactive with HAUSP that induces or upregulates HAUSP expression, an agent reactive with MDM2 that induces or upregulates MDM2 expression, and an agent reactive with an MDM2-HAUSP complex. Thus, while the specification contemplates a number of potential modulators which can be used a screening assay, the written description does not appear to be commensurate in scope with the claimed invention because the claims encompass a genus of compounds defined only by their function wherein the relationship between the structural features of members of the genus and said function have not been defined. In the absence of such a relationship either disclosed in the as filed application or which would have been recognized based upon information readily available to one skilled in the art, the skilled artisan would not know how to make and use compounds that lack structural definition. The fact that one could have assayed a compound of interest using the claimed assays does not overcome this defect since one would have no knowledge beforehand as to whether or not any given compound (other than those that might be particularly disclosed in an application) would fall within the scope of what is claimed. It would require undue experimentation (be an undue burden) to randomly screen undefined compounds for the claimed activity.

Although the description does not provide working examples, the description teaches a method for measuring the biochemical and binding activity of the specific MDM2-HAUSP interaction, and the person skilled in the art can understand how to use the screening method considering the common general knowledge.

To comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention Edith all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was "Alread[y] for patenting" such as by the use of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.

Claimed invention is drawn to an agent identified by the method of claims 54 or 57. However, no structural or specific functional characteristics of such an agent is provided, nor is there any indication that the artisan actually implemented the method of claims 54 or 57 so as to identify any agent. This situation is analogous to that of *Regents of the University of California v Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Because one skilled in the art would conclude that the inventors were not in possession of the claimed invention. The claim fails to comply with the written description requirement.

**All other rejections and/or objections are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and arguments there to.**

### *Conclusion*

Therefore, NO claim is allowed

Kinzler et al. (US 5,720,903, 1997, of record) teach a method for identifying compounds which interfere with the binding of human MDM2 to human p53 (column 33, Claim 1). Li et al. (Nature 2002; 416: 648-653, of record) teach that the deubiquitination of p53 by HAUSP is an important pathway for p53 stabilization. Together, Kinzler et al. and Li et al. are considered to be the closest prior art. However, the references alone or in combination do not appear to teach or suggest a method of identifying an agent that is reactive with HAUSP/MDM2, wherein the agent is

Art Unit: 1642

in the presence of both MDM2 and HAUSP. As such, claims 47-48, 54, 57, 61-63 appear to be free of the prior art.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shanon Foley can be reached on 571-272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1642

  
SHANON FOLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

